THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII MARCH, 1955 No. 417

Editorial

IT has for long seemed to us strange that "democracy", which was until the latter part of the nineteenth century regarded with horror by most Englishmen, almost suddenly came to be spoken of as a good thing. "If you will have democracy", said Lord Salisbury, "you must have something like Caesarism to control it", and following Disraeli he enumerated its fruits as extravagant expenditure, discontent in meeting it, rash wars, humiliating treaties, insecurity of property and of liberty—the whole culminating in a reaction to despotism.[1] But in 1935 Mr Stanley Baldwin could regretfully say, "The world was never more unsafe for democracy than it is to-day."[2] Most of his predecessors would have said that nothing could be more unsafe for the world than democracy! The theologians as well as the politicians seemed to change their tune. For example, whereas to F. D. Maurice democray was an object of dread, William Temple in his *Essays in Christian Politics* has an essay in favour of it.

The explantion of this change lies not only in the fact that the extension of the franchise did not have the awful results that had been apprehended, nor in the reassuring effects of Lord Randolph Churchill's rhetoric about "Tory democracy", but in a transmutation of the meaning of the word. In the earlier period "democracy" meant in theory the sovereignty of the people and in practice mob-rule, but it came to be used much more generally to signify any government that was subject to popular consent or a free society as opposed to an autocracy or a dictatorship. And then many writers found it convenient to make the word "democratic" denote definite, and often admirable, political ideas which neither etymologically nor historically it was suited to denote. Anyhow, the word has now been used and abused in so many different ways that in the interests of clarity it is best dropped.

Lord Percy of Newcastle in his book *The Heresy of Democracy*[3] has less to say about the uses and abuses of the word than we should have expected, nor is he at pains to illustrate the fog that surrounds it. The "democracy" which he regards as heretical is "the distinctive democracy of the French Revolution", which he is concerned to contrast with "the practice of parliamentary government by popular consent". As he says, not even the U.S.A. is a democracy in his sense of the term. Lord Percy makes no suggestion that the extension of the franchise in Britain should be withdrawn, and actually the kind of government he favours bears a close resemblance to what William Temple was commending in the essay on "Democracy" to which we

[1] See A. L. Kennedy, *Salisbury 1830–1903*, p. 35; Lady Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury*, i, 146.

[2] Speech in the House of Commons, 12 March 1935.

[3] Eyre and Spottiswoode. 18s.

have referred. They are equally determined to found their political philosophy in theology and to moralize the conception of the State.

In drawing out the contrast between the traditions of government that have developed in Britain and France, Lord Percy is abundantly justified. The contrast has of course been pointed out and enlarged upon before, though Lord Percy seems to be scarcely aware of the fact. His book might make more impact if he engaged more closely in debate with his contemporaries, but he appears both as a politician and as a thinker to prefer to stand apart.

No one perhaps since F. D. Maurice has attacked the dogma of popular sovereignty with such prophetic fervour, and there are probably many Christians who do not yet realize the objections to which this dogma is exposed. More than that, Lord Percy's essay, though historians and theologians will find some of his generalizations rather slapdash, may do much good in bringing fresh air into the doldrums in which fundamental political thought in Britain is now becalmed. He takes a large historical canvas on which to work out his thesis that "the difference between good and bad government lies, not in what men from time to time devise, but in what they believe". The thesis would have stood out more sharply if it had been argued more closely. Lord Percy's writing lacks the precision of Mr T. S. Eliot's prose, and Mr Christopher Dawson's sureness of touch, and M. Jacques Maritain's elaborate consistency (to name three more or less kindred minds), but he is more eloquent than any of them. A more satisfactory title for the book might have been *The State in its Relations with the Church*. Except for its style, it has a good deal in common with Mr Gladstone's early essay, and is worth reading for the same reason that what Macaulay was long supposed to have exploded is still deserving of attention.

* * * * *

It is not too early to recommend the Clergy Vacation Courses which are to be held at St Augustine's College, Canterbury, during July and August this year. They are advertised elsewhere in this number. We believe that in some enlightened dioceses funds are made available to enable parish priests to attend such courses; if so, they are certainly well spent.

Preaching as Corporate Worship

It is a strange phenomenon that in the spate of literature which appears on the subject of "Preaching" so little attention is paid to that aspect of it which we may call "Preaching as Corporate Worship". The purpose of this article is to recall attention to this important matter.

I. Preaching is an act of worship on the part of the preacher.

Life, if rightly viewed, is to the Christian *all* worship. Zechariah foresaw a day when the bells of the horses and every pot in Jerusalem

and in Judah would "be Holiness unto the Lord of Hosts" (14. 20, 21). That day for the Christian has arrived. For him there can be no divide between the sacred and the secular. Shoes well cleaned, washing-up well done, reading faithfully pursued, visiting dutifully performed, the sermon prepared to the best of his ability—all these are acts of worship.

For the preacher, preaching ranks high in those acts of worship which he offers to his Lord. In those twenty minutes on Sunday morning or evening he offers up to God the best that he has, the fruit of the week's preparation, the fruit of his exegetical wrestlings and of his toil with the stuff of men's problems in the light of God's revelation in Christ mediated by the Holy Spirit, the fruit of his effort to find the best medium of expression for eternal truth to men totally unaccustomed to the thought-forms of an Hebraic revelation.

Here is worship worthy of a thinking man (Rom. 12. 1), an art, the highest art known to man, dedicated to him who has entrusted it to him. Here is an offering of mind and thought, of speech, of diction and of presentation to the Creator-God who gave these faculties for human use. Only when preaching is envisaged thus can the invocation "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" have full meaning. "Worship is man's acknowledgement of the worth-ship of God with every part of his being" (Bishop Colin Dunlop, *Anglican Public Worship*, p. 19). Preaching is a glorious expression of this.

But preaching is more than this.

II. Preaching is an act of corporate worship, an action of the Body of Christ.

Mr Gladstone in his *Homeric Studies* wrote: "The work of the orator from its very inception is inextricably mixed up with practice. It is cast in the mould offered to him by the minds of his hearers. It is an influence principally received from his audience (so to speak) in vapour, which he pours back on them in a flood. The sympathy and concurrence of his time is, with his own mind, joint parent of the work." It is deeply interesting that one who had trained himself meticulously in the art of public speaking, and had studied and absorbed Quintilian and Cicero, could yet write: "I wish you knew the state of total impotence to which I should be reduced if there were no echo to the accents of my own voice." In similar vein, Dame Sybil Thorndike, broadcasting on 22 June 1954, said in reference to the effect of the audience on an actor or actress: "The quality of the audience makes all the difference in the world."

So much for secular illustrations. To come nearer home—any preacher of experience will bear witness to this fact, that in Church A one Sunday, having prepared himself and his sermon with care and prayer, he finds that his words rebound like a fives ball from the wall of the court. In Church B the following Sunday, the preparation of himself and of his sermon having been the same as during the previous week, he finds a receptivity to the Word of God and a response to it so manifest and real as to be almost tangible. What is

the reason for this? No doubt many factors are involved. I suspect, however, that one of the most important is this—the members of congregation A have never grasped the fact that preaching is a function, a corporate activity, of the Church. They come to listen, perchance to indulge in "a little folding of the hands in sleep", perhaps to find fuel for an interesting criticism over lunch of the parson's jejune effort. But at Church B the members of the congregation know that prayerful dedication on the part of the preacher is not enough—something is demanded of *them*. Preaching is a *corporate* activity. It is not likely that all the members of congregation B have learned that lesson, but a "godly remnant" has. And God has a way of working his strange work through godly remnants at various stages in the world's history; and he still does it, even at St Agatha's in 1955.

A friend of the writer's found his preaching work something of a grim battle. Then there came a time when, to use his own words, he had "come out of the tunnel". He did not expect that preaching thenceforward would be easy, but he knew that he was out into the light and that preaching would be a different thing from that time on. When asked if he could put his finger on the reason for this, he said he had shared his difficulties with about three members of his parish. They had promised to pray. In this way his preaching was more than an individual effort; it had become the work of the Body of Christ in that parish.

Here our doctrine of the Body of Christ links up with our doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which is indeed the *Spirit of the Body*. Canon C. E. Raven, in the Gifford Lectures for 1951–2, wrote of the fellowship:

"As the several members find each its proper function in the economy of the whole, their fellowship develops a spontaneous co-operation in obedience to the creative guidance of the indwelling Spirit; each individual unit finds his freedom in the voluntary service of the whole, the whole is possessed of the full power and resources of its constituents. To describe it as 'one body and one Spirit' is no exaggeration; and available for it are the resources of God. Sensitiveness integrates the community as the barriers of individuality are transcended; creativity inspires it as it gains release from fears and selfish ambitions; power without limit is at its disposal when there is no longer the wastage of inward conflict and when the Spirit of Christ is given free course" (Vol. II, *Experience and Interpretation*, p. 176).

If we examine preaching as a corporate act of worship more closely we find:

(1) *It is an offering of* PRAYER. "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father" (Matt. 18. 19). The congregation's prayers have upheld the preacher during the week and immediately before the service. Even during the sermon a shaft of ejaculatory prayer sometimes rises. More than this, the whole atmosphere in which the preaching takes place is an atmosphere of prayer.

(2) *It is an offering of the* MIND, of concentration, a dedication of the mind with which, according to the command of our Lord, we are

to love the Lord our God. The congregation has in view the grasping of some new, or neglected, or previously misunderstood, part of the revelation of God. The minds of its members are "erect to Almighty God". (The phrase is quoted by Bishop Colin Dunlop, op. cit., p. 64, from the preface attached to the English Litany on its first appearance in 1544.)

(3) *It is an offering of the* WILL, for the carrying into practice of what has been learned of the mind of God through the preaching. Preaching can never be simply mental gymnastics, either for preacher or for congregation. At some point it must assault the *will*. And worship takes place when a man utters his Amen, his assent to the divine assault, when he offers himself in response to the divine coming in the word preached.

If the two main propositions of this article are correct they will have at least three outcomes:

I. Preaching will be to us a very holy thing.

To be a "herald of God" is at once a thrilling and an awe-full thing. It calls for qualities of holiness (whole-ness) which are not demanded necessarily of the essayist or of the lecturer. To say with prophetic power "Thus saith the Lord" is no light thing. It can be done only by a man in close touch with his Lord. Amy Wilson Carmichael in one of her poems wrote:

> So would I tread where Thou hast trod,
> My spirit tender of the glory of God.

Worship is no light and easy thing; nor is this great act of worship which we call preaching. It can be accomplished only by those who are "tender of the glory of God".

II. The truth of preaching as corporate worship will need teaching to our people.

Here considerable patience and perseverance will be called for. Long years of regarding the sermon as something done by the speaker have left deep marks on the minds of our people. We shall not eradicate these marks overnight. Patiently, prayerfully, persistently, we shall teach that when the vicar or curate enters the pulpit *the Church goes into action* in a great act of corporate worship, in prayer, in offering of the mind, in offering of the will. This we shall teach and a remnant will glimpse it. In that remnant (a remnant which, please God, will steadily grow) lies our hope.

III. We shall need to think out, and slowly work out, the bearing of this on our services.

Many churches in recent years have proved that a 9.30 or 10 a.m. celebration of the Holy Communion meets the need of people better than services held at the more usual hours of 8 and 11 a.m. There is much to be said for this and for the breakfast which often follows it—a practical and very real bit of parish fellowship. But there are dangers. If what we have said about preaching is true, five- to ten-minute sermons squeezed into the Holy Communion Service *will*

not do. In addition, those five or ten minutes tend in the context of the Holy Communion to be occupied almost exclusively with the theme of Holy Communion itself. This, it need not be said, is a subject of immense importance. But the task of preaching is wider than this, inasmuch as the preacher must seek to cover "the *whole* counsel of God". We would not be so foolish as to try to play off, the one against the other, the ministry of Word and Sacrament. That would indeed be foolish, and as un-Biblical as it is un-Anglican. Both are ministries of the Grace of God. Both are *verba Dei.* But we must seek to keep a right proportion. We must resist to the death the attitude which says, "The sermon matters comparatively little—it is the *worship* that matters." That we have seen to be a contradiction in terms. "People come to worship, not to listen to sermons"—with that we will have nothing to do. Again, we shall resist to the death the attitude which looks on everything up to the notices as what in some circles are called "the preliminary exercises", to be followed, as soon as decently may be, by the "real thing"—the sermon. *Both* are corporate worship.

Rather, in the context of Matins or Evensong, we shall say at the end of the Third Collect or of the prayers succeeding it, "That is the end of Part I of our corporate worship. Now together we move forward to its worthy climax, the next act of corporate worship—the sermon." In the context of the Holy Communion we shall say, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us—*look!* The Body broken, the Blood outpoured. *Listen!* The Word preached. 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord, Most High.' "

This article began with a comment in regard to the strange lack in the textbooks of this emphasis on preaching as corporate worship. An exception, in this as in so many important matters of theology, is to be found in the writings of P. T. Forsyth. In his great book *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* he has a chapter entitled "The Preacher and his Church, or, Preaching as Worship". It is tempting to quote at length but space forbids. One cannot refuse, however, the temptation to quote a few sentences almost at random. Having described preaching as "a sacramental act, done together with the community in the name and the power of Christ's redeeming Act and our common faith", Forsyth asks: "Are our sermons action sermons? If they are not . . . is it because they lack behind them the volume of a Church's conviction, a Church's faith, the impact of a whole Church's rule?" "The word is living only in a living community." "Preaching is the organized Hallelujah of an ordered community." "Preaching . . . is the Church confessing its faith." So we could go on quoting from a memorable chapter. But it is unnecessary. For, once we envisage preaching as "the organized Hallelujah of an ordered community", there need be little fear that we shall feel, as did Mr Gerald Bullett's Nicky, after going to Evensong in a country parish church, that "God, if he ever attended the place of worship, always slipped quietly out, it seemed, just before the sermon".

F. D. Coggan.

Anglican Religious Communities: Their Revival and Present Status

WHEN the storms of the Reformation in England had abated, and the Church was regaining poise and stability, a renewed desire for an ordered way of dedicated life was often expressed. The virgin state which was notably honoured in the primitive church was once again regarded as one of the great ideals of the Gospel. Among those who praised it were Hooker, Andrewes, Herbert, Laud, and, later, Jeremy Taylor, Thorndike, and William Law. This is not surprising in view of the Anglican appeal to the Scriptures and to the early fathers and doctors of the Church. St Athanasius speaks of virginity as angelic and unsurpassed, and again of the holy and unearthly way, rugged and hard to accomplish, which yields the perfect fruit, namely a hundredfold (Ath. Letter 48). St Augustine says it is honoured not because it is virginity but because it is dedicated to God, and although it is kept in the flesh yet it is kept by religion and devotion of the Spirit (*De Virg.* viii).

The Swedish theologian Brilioth in his book *The Anglican Revival* draws attention to this appeal to the early fathers, especially in connexion with their exaltation of virginity.

In the history of the Church such aspirations have led to life in community with the further discipline of personal poverty and obedience to rule. So in the Catholic revival of the seventeenth century led by bishops, notably Laud and Andrewes, such a way of life found an ordered expression under Nicolas Ferrar at Little Gidding. Though nicknamed the Arminian nunnery it could not be called a religious community, but it was a notable attempt to live an ordered and disciplined life centred on common worship.

Bishop Bramhall, exiled during the Puritan ascendancy and after the Restoration brought home to be Archbishop of Armagh, contended that monastic institutions were not foreign to the reformed Church and that the wholesale destruction of them by Henry VIII was promoted by other motives than religion. After the Restoration a community of women was founded by William Sancroft, who was Dean of St Paul's when the present cathedral was built and later became Archbishop of Canterbury. Its numbers never exceeded twelve.

Edward Stephens, of liturgical fame, founded a community which numbered twenty-one members. The rule he drew up for them is still extant, being embodied in a letter he wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury. These ladies attended a daily eucharist at St Giles', Cripplegate. He had hoped to get under way a similar community for men; but largely owing to the non-juring secession these aspirations led to no permanent conventual foundation.

The Catholic revival of the nineteenth century also emphasized the Anglican appeal to the early Church. An English translation of the Fathers was issued entitled *The Library of the Fathers*. This was followed by a collection of the works of the Caroline divines, *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, in which we see the great

Catholic river taking on the colour of the English soil through which it flows. Dr Pusey, the leader of this revival, was the first to assist in the foundation of communities which, unlike the earlier attempts, have shown vigorous and enduring life. The first woman to give herself to a life of self-dedication under his guidance was Rebecca Marian Hughes, but it was some eight years before she was free to live it in a community. This is the more interesting as in the early Church those who responded to the same vocation remained in their homes to begin with, life in community being a further development.[1]

Priscilla Lydia Sellon, another of Pusey's spiritual children, founded a community which is represented to-day by the Society of the Holy Trinity at Ascot. Other foundations of the same period were the communities whose well-known mother houses are at Wantage, East Grinstead, Clewer, and Horbury.

Conventual life for men came later, and was established by such founders as Richard Benson, Herbert Kelly, and Charles Gore.

Considering the ecclesiastical outlook of the time such a revival was bound to be misunderstood and therefore met with opposition. There was the Roman bogey; for the new communities were closely associated with the leaders of a movement which after the secession of Newman and others was widely suspect. This suspicion was in some measure allayed by the heroic works of mercy to which the Sisters devoted themselves, particularly during the Crimean War and the cholera epidemic in Bethnal Green.

A more serious difficulty arose over profession by permanent vows. Such vows bind religious to their vocation and constitute the religious state, and can be dispensed only by ecclesiastical authority. Every now and then a bishop would be faced with a request for such a dispensation, and for this he had no authoritative guidance. That ladies should live together, occupied so long as they desired, in piety and works of charity was one thing—it raised no ecclesiastical problem: it was quite another thing that they should enter upon a state of life to which they bound themselves by permanent vows. Dr Tait, when Bishop of London, regarded such vows as illegal and void. He was prepared, however, to permit renewable promises, but not vows. Yet it was not groups of people united for the purpose of charitable work that the fathers of the early Church commended, but, as is made plain by their emphasis on virginity, those who had made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Unlike Dr Tait, Bishop Wilberforce, in a correspondence with Fr Benson of Cowley, 1865, accepted the latters defence of religious profession by vows, though at first he had demurred; this was the time of the foundation of the Society of St John the Evangelist in the diocese of Oxford.

Vocations to community life were all the while increasing. Some parish priests appear to have thought that it was as easy to found a

[1] The community which she founded—the Society of the Holy and Undivided Trinity—now has its mother house at South Leigh, near Oxford.

community of parish sisters as to start a branch of the Girls' Friendly Society; so it is not surprising that some of these ill-advised attempts flickered out. Yet, through readiness to learn and to accept the best guidance available, there were by the beginning of this century about twice as many women of the English Church in religious houses as there were at the time of the dissolution over 300 years before.

A German observer, Paula Schaefer, in a book entitled *The Catholic Regeneration of the Church of England*, can say, "The story of the revitalization of the Orders is probably without parallel in the whole history of the Church."

More formal episcopal recognition came by stages. Some bishops licensed chaplains and wardens to the sisterhoods, they administered confirmation in their chapels to women and girls under the sisters' care; bishops too dedicated new conventual buildings, and took the further step of officiating at professions. Thus the early fluid period began to settle into one of crystallization.

At the Lambeth Conference of 1897 the bishops of the Anglican Communion expressed in their Encyclical Letter their thankfulness for the increasing readiness which the communities had manifested to be brought into closer union with the episcopate. In a report of a committee of the same Conference, signed by Bishop Stubbs of Oxford, the question of vows was touched upon and also the power of dispensing from them, but no specific recommendations were made.

In anticipation of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, which was to deal more fully with such matters, a gathering of representatives of religious communities, both of men and women, was held at Keble College, Oxford, in January of the same year. Some tentative regulations drawn up by a committee of bishops and religious were the main subject of discussion. It was a great opportunity for the communities to learn about one another's methods and ways, and to consider more carefully their place as religious in the life of the Church as a whole.

In the following summer the bishops at Lambeth adopted a resolution advising "the establishment of closer co-operation between the Episcopate and the communities either by Canon or other means". The committee appointed to consider this resolution advised the formation of an advisory council such as would be acceptable to the bishops and communities. Meanwhile the Conference had approved the different types of religious life, including the enclosed contemplative life.

It should be realized that the Lambeth Conference is an advisory and consultative gathering. Its recommendations and resolutions have no binding authority unless and until they are promulgated by the provincial synods of the Church. In the Episcopal Church of the United States the closer co-operation is now established by Canon, but in the Provinces of Canterbury and York the means adopted is that of the advisory council referred to above.

Thus the year 1930 heralded the termination of the experimental

period of the revival of the religious life which began close on a hundred years before.

Let us now turn to the Reports of Convocation of the year 1934 for the renewal of its synodical recognition in England. At this time there were two members of Convocation who, being themselves experienced religious, had first-hand knowledge of community life—the Bishop of Truro, Father Frere, in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, and Father Talbot in the Lower House of York. The bishops of the Upper House of each Province sent down to the Lower House for consideration and comment the scheme for an advisory council and the draft regulations which had been submitted to them. After that, they were taken in hand by a committee of bishops.

The draft regulations made provision for the taking of permanent vows, for it was fully recognized that the communities would regard this as essential. The Convocations of both Provinces agreed to the formation of an advisory council, to which the regulations would be submitted for further revision.

In 1935 the council was formed, consisting of an episcopal chairman appointed by the Archbishops, twelve members, of whom six are appointed by the bishops of both Provinces and six by the communities. The latter six form a standing committee. The first chairman was Dr Seaton, Bishop of Wakefield, and the first secretary Dr Harton, now Dean of Wells. This Council has no coercive powers, but it has an increasing moral authority and prestige, owing to its authorization by the Convocations, the constitution of its membership, and the wise direction and counsel which it can be relied upon to give. The rules and constitutions or charters of the communities were duly examined by the council, a task made less arduous in some cases through a preliminary revision already made as the result of experience, and often after consultation with one of the wisest of guides, the later Father L. Carey, S.S.J.E.

Now that religious profession under permanent vows has been reaffirmed by the English Church, some communities which hitherto had not bound themselves in that way have subsequently done so. In respect of dispensations the Archbishop of Canterbury is recognized as the final court of appeal, in accordance with an Act of Parliament of 1534.

In 1943 the advisory council issued *A Directory of the Religious Life* with the authority of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and with a foreword by Archbishop Lang written before his retirement in 1941. It contains a remarkably concise and accurate definition of technical terms and four appendices; the first, on matters to be provided for in the charter or constitution of a community, the other three on the manner of episcopal visitations. According to the Directory every community is to have a visitor, approved by the diocesan, and, if the visitor be a bishop of another province, approved by the Metropolitan also.

There are clear definitions of the religious state, of communities, contemplative, active, and mixed. One section deals with the Bene-

dictine way of life. The solitary life is also formally recognized, and guidance is given as to all that concerns the common life in connexion with worship, administration, and property.

Such is the means appointed by the synods of the two English Provinces to secure the closer co-operation between the episcopate and the communities which has been so long desired.

In the preface to the proposed revision of Canon Law, the advisory council is regarded as meeting all practical requirements in respect of community life. It is to be noted that provision is made for the ordination of suitable members of men's communities and the conditions they must fulfil are there laid down.

More recently the status and importance of the advisory council has been recognized in another matter: that when a community desires the exemption of a lay brother from military service the Government department concerned accepts the advice of the council as the authority through which the claim should be made.

Still further encouragement has been given to the place of the religious life by the Lambeth Conference of 1948. In the resolutions, signed by all the bishops of the Anglican Communion who attended, the thirty-seventh resolution reads, "The Conference urges clergy, teachers, and parents to seek for and encourage among young people vocations to Holy Orders, to the teaching ministry, to religious communities, and to other forms of full-time service in the Church at home or abroad."

Such, briefly, is the history of a hundred years of the revival of the religious life in the English Church. Its growth and extension among men has been slow, but in most parts of the Anglican Communion there are already well-established religious houses, many of which are overseas foundations.

But though now under regularized episcopal supervision, there has been no attempt to regiment the communities or to create a highly centralized control. Freedom of direct response to the call and the vision given by God remains unfettered. The family spirit which has been characteristic from the beginning of the revival continues unhindered. At the same time the communities are not free-lance institutions; they belong to the Church and gladly welcome its discipline and guidance. With their emphasis on obedience it could not be otherwise. They and the bishops have steadily aimed at and worked for the present status and the position which has now been attained. It is an outstanding example of that ordered liberty which we prize so highly, of a control allowing a maximum of freedom and flexibility, all of which makes for the well-being of the communities themselves and for the effective service which they seek to render to God and his Church.

R. L. Wrathall, C.R.

Dr Thomas Bray

THIS article[1] is about a man who is not so famous as he should be, for to many churchpeople the name of Thomas Bray is unknown. Some indeed know him as the man who, by founding two great Societies—the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G.—set in motion that missionary work which has since spread all over the world. But he did much more than found these Societies.

Thomas Bray was born all but 300 years ago, in 1658, the only son of a peasant farmer in the Shropshire parish of Chirbury, close to the Welsh border. The boy showed remarkable gifts, and Mr Lewis, the rector of Chirbury, gave him the run of his own library—a set of chained books, which still survive—and so kindled that love of books which was one passion of his life. Perhaps it was also Mr Lewis who enabled Thomas to go to the Grammar School at Oswestry, and then on to Oxford, where, like other *pueri pauperes*, he earned his keep by acting as a servitor at All Souls College, and so took his degree. Three years later he was ordained; his gifts soon caught the notice of patrons; and after holding two small Warwickshire livings, he became rector of Sheldon, then a village of some 500 souls, now a dormitory of Birmingham.

Under the Commonwealth church life, in most country parishes, had sunk to a low ebb. Bray describes the worship as he found it: "The sottish, stupid, and unconcerned behaviour of the greatest part of people in country congregations; they do not only most shamefully sit down all the time of prayer, but for any appearance of devotion we can perceive, are as little concerned at the Divine Offices then performed, as the stones they tread on, to the exceeding great offence and disturbance of all pious and devout minds."

The young parish priest set himself to change all this. He diligently visited his people and taught them from the pulpit. But he set his chief hopes in the children and young people. These he divided into age groups, as we do to-day, and worked out for each an appropriate course of catechism teaching. But he gave special care to the youth, those over thirteen. With these he discussed each lesson after it was given; he taught them to sing the new Tate and Brady psalms, providing good tunes for them; he trained them to lead the worship in church in a reverent manner; he urged them to start family prayers, and provided forms for the purpose; he tried to build them up as a body of regular communicants. And clearly his methods succeeded, for he never tired of commending them to others. "The scandalous blemish" of irreverent worship, he wrote, "would soon be removed, should every minister have a choice society of twenty or thirty young disciples in his parish, well instructed, as in the principles of Christianity, so in the use of the Common Prayer Book; for this little leaven would soon season the whole lump."

Busy parish priest as he was, Bray found time also to read and to write. His reading was prodigious and encyclopaedic, and he seems

[1] It is based on a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on 28 November 1954.

to have remembered everything he read. As for writing, he planned a course of lectures on the first section of the Catechism which was to fill four volumes. The first stout volume proved so excellent that 3,000 copies were sold.

But this changed the course of his life. For it caught the attention of the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. Compton was deeply concerned over the American Colonies, for which he found himself responsible. The Church had completely neglected them. They had very few clergymen, and of those few some were of bad repute. Compton wanted a Commissary for Maryland, to go over and put things right. His choice fell on Thomas Bray, whose gifts as parish priest, scholar, and teacher marked him out. And Bray accepted the call, believing that "there might be a greater field for doing good in the Plantations, than by his labours here".

So in 1695 the young country clergyman, leaving Sheldon in the hands of a good curate, came to London, hired lodgings for himself and his servant for £20 a year, and embarked on his new task. He could not yet go to Maryland, for a Measure passed in the Colony to set up parishes and endow them with a poll tax of 40 lb. of tobacco leaf (the Colony's chief crop) awaited approval by the Crown, and was hotly opposed by the Quakers and Roman Catholics in the Colony. So he set to work to find and send out men to fill the many vacant posts.

And here he met a difficulty. Only such clergymen as had no good prospects in England would face the lonely and hazardous conditions of service in America; yet for that service, Bray knew, they must be well equipped with books; but these they were too poor to buy. Well, then, they must be given libraries; and Bray drew up a statement of the need, and a scheme of what he called "parochial libraries", to be set in each Maryland parish for the use of its minister. The archbishops and four bishops backed his appeal, and he sent out thousands of copies.

The scheme quickly grew. Many clergy at home were as badly in need of books and as poor as those in the Colonies. So Bray included them in the "parochial libraries" plan. Next he added "lending libraries", to be placed in country towns, for the use of the local laity as well as clergy; and then "laymen's libraries", of books and tracts to be lent to layfolk in the parishes. He was determined that every minister should be fully equipped for teaching his flock.

How high a standard Bray set for the clergy appears in a book he now published, outlining the subjects which they ought to study with a list of books upon each; the list alone covered 100 pages, and upon each book Bray added a note, usually in Latin, describing its contents. So immense was the width of his own learning—and his demand upon his brother clergy.

With the problem of libraries settled, Bray went ahead with sending men out to the Colonies. But he soon found that they would need money too; they could not live on a tobacco poll tax. So time and again he tried to find some source of endowment in England. His best chance came when Parliament was disposing of some lands for-

feited to the Crown from "superstitious uses". It was proposed to grant them to Greenwich Hospital; Bray struggled to get a share in them assigned to the Church in the Colonies. For over three months he lobbied the Members; he spent £13 in dining with them at their "ordinary", which cost 3s. 6d.; he gave a guinea each to the Clerk of Parliament and to the Doorkeeper of Parliament to gratify for the trouble he had given them. But all in vain; Greenwich Hospital got all the lands.

But failure only turned Bray's ingenious mind to new ideas. He propounded an elaborate scheme to provide the Church of England with an agency comparable to the Roman Catholic Congregation *pro propaganda fide*. But this proved too ambitious. Instead, he now launched what was to become his first great foundation. It began as a small private venture. Bray and four friends, laymen of good standing, formed themselves into "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge". Their aim was to share Bray's labours in forwarding his many plans. The S.P.C.K. grew and the plans went steadily ahead. Many charity schools were founded; libraries were provided at home and in the Colonies; round those in country towns the long-forgotten system of rural deaneries came back to life; Bray's researches had discovered what they had once been, now he revived them as a means for bringing the clergy together over their libraries, to discuss their pastoral work and breathe new life into it.

Books too were published, and popular pamphlets—devotional booklets and tracts against common vices. Thousands were distributed by chaplains in the Royal Navy; 500 *Kind Cautions against Swearing* were given to the hackney coachmen of London. The S.P.C.K. campaigned all over the country against all kinds of vice.

But now, after four years' work for Maryland in London, the way opened for Bray to visit the Colony. The Church Endowment Measure was to go back to its Assembly for revision. To cover his expenses Bray sacrificed his own savings, and in December 1699 he sailed. In the library of Sion College is his own manuscript account of the voyage: a very unpleasant one, not only because of two violent storms in which the ship's sails were blown to shreds, but through uncongenial company—a hard-drinking captain, two Romish priests, a Quaker, secretly carrying over an Order in Council which declared the Church Measure invalid, and, worst of all, an English parson going over to seek a living in Virginia, who scandalized Bray by his heavy drinking and heretical talk. More than ever was he convinced of the need for someone in the Colonies with authority to discipline the clergy.

So Bray was thankful when the three-months' voyage ended. At once he set to work to win the support of the Governor and Assembly for the Church Measure and to visit and encourage the clergy. And so great was his success that he got the Measure passed without a dissenting vote. Then, as Commissary, he held a visitation of the clergy, gave them vigorous directions for their pastoral work, and, at their request, sailed back to England to ensure the approval of the new Measure by the Crown Council. Only one thing he did

not secure—his own stipend as Commissary, which he deliberately left out of the Measure. In fact he never received it; he never considered his own interests.

He came back also with a new resolve: somehow to raise funds to support the colonial clergy through their first years, until their congregations should be able to maintain them. For this there must be a society in England empowered by charter to raise and hold and administer a great fund. So, encouraged by Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Compton, Bray, with his S.P.C.K. friends, drafted a plan for a new society—a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This he carried direct to King William; difficulties were raised, but influence smoothed them away; and on 16 June 1701 Bray received the charter of his second great foundation, the S.P.G.

The S.P.G. was designed to be, unlike the S.P.C.K., an instrument of the Church, headed by archbishops and bishops; and to it Bray handed over the task of finding, sending, and supporting clergy and teachers for the Colonial Church, though he still kept his own keen concern and care for Maryland, which the Society left to him.

Two points may be emphasized in the aims which Bray and the S.P.G. alike pursued in their work for the Colonies. First, both were as eager to convert the Indians and the Negro slaves as to provide for the spiritual needs of the colonists. Bray wanted Indian lads to be taught in the schools which he planned, that they might go as missionaries among their own people. The conversion of the slaves was always in the front of his mind: when attending King William's Court in Holland he spoke of this to the King's secretary, the Sieur D'Allone, who grew so interested that he gave large subscriptions for it, and at his death left Bray a legacy of £900 for Negro education—a trust which still, through Bray's Associates, supports schools for Negroes in the Bahamas. Bray hoped to see Negroes receiving Communion side by side with their masters: "It may rejoice our very hearts," he wrote, "to behold minds so enlightened in bodies so dark." As for the S.P.G., it instructed all its missionaries to teach and convert all Indians and Negroes within their reach.

And secondly, both Bray and the S.P.G. did their utmost to get a bishop appointed, or at least a commissary, to foster, guide, and discipline the Church in the Colonies. Bray tried to buy lands out there to provide a stipend; he offered to stock them with slaves and cattle and pigs; he asked that a good living in Maryland should be annexed for the commissary. But all his efforts and those of the S.P.G. were in vain. The Church in America was left without a bishop of its own for another eighty years, to its immeasurable loss.

Those who start great movements or found important societies usually want to keep a hand upon them for as long as possible. Not so Thomas Bray; he was humble enough to leave others to develop and guide the great works which he had started. After nine crowded years at the heart of affairs in London, having at long last got the Maryland Measure approved, he went back again to parish life; first at Sheldon, then at St Botolph's Without, in Aldgate, where he spent the last twenty-one years of his life. Even when back in London he

did not try to resume any control in his societies, appearing seldom at the S.P.C.K., never at the S.P.G.

But that did not mean that he was any less active. Still he threw his full energies into parochial duties and into many outside interests. At St Botolph's, which still stands much as it was in his day, he kept a full round of Sunday and weekday services, with many additional endowed sermons to be preached. Troubled over the size of its population, Bray set himself to build another church, and sacrificed £100 of his own stipend to endow it. He could be seen, as of old, catechizing the children in three grades and caring specially for the youth; a visitor remarked on the number of young people at his evening service, even in his old age. He held special services for the old people in the workhouse.

Among his great outside interests were the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, whose agents denounced and prosecuted all kinds of vice. To him they turned to preach at the funeral of one of these agents, Mr John Dent, killed in helping a constable in an affray with three soldiers. In his sermon Bray denounced the Playhouse as "a seminary of Atheism, Impiety, and Immorality", and Mayfair as "that horrible den of Impiety", which the magistrates rightly wanted to pull down.

Still he wrote books; still he started many libraries; still he kept in close touch with Maryland and gave counsel to its clergy. He took young men to train as missionaries, providing them with a special library and, "to inure them to the most distasteful parts of their office", sent them to read and preach to the inmates of the prisons, for whom also he provided bread, beef, and broth on Sundays.

This concern for prisoners led to the last of Bray's many projects. It brought him into touch with General Oglethorpe, who had set on foot a Parliamentary inquiry into the scandals of the debtors' prisons which led to the release of many of their unhappy victims. But what could they do when released? Captain Coram, the famous founder of the Foundling Hospital, records that Bray, now aged and bedridden, declared that he would find a way to settle them happily in America, and started the plan by which, after his death, the Colony of Georgia was founded. The project was indeed managed, in its early stages, by Bray's Associates, the body to whom he left the care of his library schemes and the D'Allone trust for Negro education.

So, up to the last, Bray was busy in many good works and schemes, as well as his parochial duties. He died, in his seventy-second year, on 15 February 1730; his body lies in St Botolph's, where he so faithfully served.

"I am called a projector," wrote Bray, "upon the account of these designs I am continually forming." He was indeed prolific of designs; and how fruitful those designs were, beyond all that their projector could have foreseen. To the Church at home his schools, his teaching plans, his libraries, his ideals for clerical life, gave new vitality. To the American Colonies his libraries brought almost the only stream of good literature that many of them could then obtain. And his two

great societies, the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G., not only saved the Church in America but grew beyond all he imagined in power and scope of work and began that great venture which has spread our Church throughout the world.

H. P. THOMPSON.

Letter from South India

CIRCULAR letters to their "friends and relations" present overseas missionaries with a particular problem: how to entertain at once the bishops and the shop assistants who teach in Sunday school, the devout ladies and the army friends who have not entered a church since their war-time weddings. This dispatch is in this respect easier. With respectful attention to the many layfolk and to the non-Anglicans who read THEOLOGY, it is fair to regard the representative reader as in Anglican orders; to see him, for instance, in terms of that unofficial group which meets monthly for prayer and devotional study in a north-country rectory, or of that diocesan clergy cricket team which battles annually with the local doctors on a famous county ground.

But though the constituency may be more amenable the technique must be the same. So much propaganda (in the best sense of that word) has been written about the Church of South India, for and against, that this correspondent's only hope is to renounce any party line, a renunciation congenial enough, and write personally, seeking to open a window from within.

Within a week of arriving in India in the spring of 1953 I found evidence both of the limitations and of the progress of the new unity. Owing to the expected birth of our third child, who comes into the story later, we went straight to a hill station. It at once appeared that here the more vigorous stream of church life flowed outside the C.S.I., maintained by Baptists, Brethren and other fundamentalist Christians, many of them members indeed of the uniting Churches but outside the united Church by reason of their convictions. The vague Anglican surmise that, for better or for worse according to your convictions, C.S.I. is "more Protestant than us" received a salutary shock. For here at least she stood over against the fundamentalists as the sober, perhaps too sober, champion of the historic continuity of the visible Church.

The second limitation is ultimately more dangerous, though not peculiar to the C.S.I. That same first week I asked a missionary lady if her cook was a Christian. "Oh no," she cheerfully replied, "he's a Catholic." In thus surrendering to Rome her own birthright of catholicity she also denied the name of Christian to the communion of Xavier and a thousand lesser saintly benefactors of this land. Let that incident stand as a symbol of the virtual isolation of non-Roman from Roman Christians, an isolation to which many ardent workers for church unity seem strangely indifferent. Yet even here we may find ourselves ahead of the West. The union already achieved could

make co-operation with Roman Christians on local matters easier and quicker. And the ultimate aim of organic union with them can now be presented as a positive challenge to our Church, instead of a merely negative deterrent to closer relations with non-episcopal Churches. For this latter of course it is now too late.

Signs of progress? That same first Sunday morning in the hill station I could not but be aware of the resemblance to any village church in England, even to the hats of the ladies in the choir and the monuments to military gentlemen upon the walls. But one thing was strikingly different. The C.S.I. liturgy was celebrated. And the fact of union was gloriously apparent, where Anglicans would most have it apparent, in the public worship of God. This liturgy is making steady progress. I have had many opportunities of using it. As one brought up on the Book of Common Prayer, I still miss the great sense of climax effected by the juxtaposition of the "words of consecration" and the communion of the people. Yet if the sense of the eternal does not break in so dramatically at the breaking of the bread, it does the more readily pervade the service as a whole, after the manner, I understand, of the Eastern Orthodox Liturgy.

But these are delicate matters for an unaccustomed pen. I shall do better to show the effect of the service as a bond of unity by a contrast. Some years ago my wife and I and another Anglican, now also a presbyter in the C.S.I., attended a conference of French Protestant students in Paris. The climax was a celebration of the Lord's Supper at which some six hundred communicated. We heard the same Gospel, recited the same Creed, though in a foreign language. We joined in responses made familiar from their presence in our own prayer book. But, acting on advice from the highest authority, I did not communicate. The pain and frustration of this decision is no doubt a commonplace to some readers of THEOLOGY.

But last year I attended a student conference in Mysore State. The climax was a celebration of the "Lord's Supper or the Holy Eucharist", as it is styled in the C.S.I. Held in the local church, the service was in Cannarese, the language of the local congregation. The many students who were ignorant of this language took part in Tamil or English. The local pastor and I concelebrated, breaking the bread together. Once before I had had the joy of sharing in a concelebration, at the Dedication Festival of the Queen's College, Birmingham. But this was different. For the elderly Indian pastor was of the Congregationalist tradition, I of the Anglican, united in the breaking of the bread. The wine was distributed in small glasses and according to their custom we all ate and drank at one moment. Thus was effectively symbolized a high doctrine of the local church, a participation in the Holy Communion not so much one by one as individuals, but rather all together as the Church of God.

The conference ended that evening with the Methodist Covenant Service. May I recommend it to those readers who do not know it? It might prove the answer to your prayers for an adequate watch-night service on New Year's Eve, for inaugurating the next session of the men's fellowship, for "the vicar's turn" at the Mothers' Union,

or even for Remembrance Sunday. To share such traditions of worship is not the least of the fruits of union.

From the one gospel sacrament let us turn to the other. The first baptism I attended here was at a teachers' training college. The baptism was out of doors, by immersion in a cistern. None of this sprinkling! Some candidates were girls from the school attached; the majority were teachers in training; none were infants. This reflects the principle behind the new Baptism Service on which the Church's liturgical committee is now working. In contrast to the Book of Common Prayer but in accord with the missionary emphasis of a minority Church, adult baptism is to be taken as the norm, with infant baptism as an acceptable alternative. I understand that according to one proposal under consideration, one godparent is to be chosen by the congregation. As in the Prayer Book, the service is to be held when the congregation is present for Sunday worship.

In the C.S.I. of course this should mean during the celebration of the Lord's Supper or the Holy Eucharist. Here I was able to pass on to one of the committee what a former S.P.G. missionary in Japan had told me: that there candidates were often baptized between the epistle and the gospel, so that the first words that they hear as baptized Christians are the gospel, the first words that they say, the creed. It is, I suppose, unlikely that this titbit will find its way into the C.S.I. service. But it illustrates how the rank and file among the presbyters may contribute to the form of the new unity. Perhaps that sentence requires qualification. For it remains unfortunately true that European missionaries still play a possibly disproportionate part in this exciting technical work.

I warned you that our third child would come in later. Let me quote the description of her baptism sent to our "friends and relations". "The Bishop (ex-Methodist) baptized her, using the 1928 Prayer Book Service and inserting additional questions to the parents from Methodist usage. The Principal's wife (ex-Congregationalist) held the baby. She and the parents stood proxy for three Anglican godparents (in England). The full normal congregation was present, plus some visitors. An ex-Methodist commented on the way the gospel of God is proclaimed in the form and matter of the service. A friend, a presbyter in the C.S.I., on receiving my description, wrote to say how glad he was that 'Jane had been made a Christian in so really catholic a way!'"

To that description I would now make one amendment. I would not now refer to ex-Methodists, ex-Congregationalists; but rather, as was, I believe, first suggested by one of our bishops, to Methodists-plus and Congregationalists-plus; and of course to Anglicans-plus. On being commissioned as a presbyter of the C.S.I., I was not aware of having surrendered one jot of my previous ordination to the priesthood. I did not become ex-Anglican. Without that previous ordination the commissioning would have been meaningless. But while the commissioning could add nothing to the grace of orders, it certainly added something to the sphere in which those orders could be exercised. As the bishop said on that occasion in his first

charge to the diocese—an Anglican contribution, this idea of a bishop's charge—"The Anglicans play upon their harp, not loudly but insistently, the Methodists blow their trumpet, and the Congregationalists beat their drum." The harmony is by no means fully resolved. But the practices continue, the rehearsals, dare we say it, for the heavenly concert of praise and thanksgiving when all shall be one in Christ.

A. H. DAMMERS.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Coggan is Principal of the London College of Divinity.

The Rev. R. L. Wrathall, C.R., is Prior of the House of the Resurrection, Mirfield.

The Rev. H. P. Thompson is the author of the book which is reviewed on p. 112.

The Rev. A. H. Dammers is Chaplain and Lecturer in English at St John's College, Palamcottah.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH AND RACE RELATIONS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Provost of Nairobi, in his kind review of my book, *The Chosen People, or The Bible, Christianity and Race,* invites me to say more on two particular points.

(1) He writes, "Almost all Churches admit that in Christ . . . we are all one. . . . What is not so clear to many . . . is that it is clearly the will of God that what is true within the Church is to be worked out outside it in the world of politics and social life."

In regard to this I would suggest, first, that God's revealed will for human conduct, including all that comes under the heading "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", applies to all men, and not merely to Christians and their relationships with one another. Our Lord defined one's "neighbour" by a parable in which the principal character was one of those with whom the Jews had "no dealings" on both religious and racial grounds. The "Christian" moral law, whether in its personal or social aspects, can be rightly so called only in the sense that it is the Christians who believe it to be God's own law, and therefore of universal application. It follows that Christians are required to keep this law, and to endeavour to promote its observance, in the world of politics and social life, and not only among themselves.

But, secondly, the Christian revelation offers no hope that man can live, as God intends him to live, otherwise than by the saving grace of Christ. Nor does it set forward any prospect of peaceful and harmonious relationships between man and man, nation and nation,

race and race, save within the family and kingdom of God. Christianity cannot solve the world's problems, if the world rejects Christianity. There is hope in Christ, but nowhere else.

Thirdly, this does not of course imply any limitation of the good will or of the promises of God. He appeals to all men, of every nation and race, to enter his kingdom, and, within it, to find the solution of all their problems—personal, social, and political. The supreme task of the Church, therefore, in the face of racial as of all other problems, is to win men and women of every race to penitence, faith, and obedience to God. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." Christianity knows no other way.

(2) The Provost's second point, if I rightly understand it, is that a genuinely multi-racial government in a country like Kenya would include a considerable proportion, perhaps a majority, of non-Christians. It would therefore be unlikely to give Christian missions the support they now receive from government, or to seek their aid in dealing with the spiritual aspect of such a phenomenon as Mau Mau.

It is a good many years since I was last in Kenya, and I must speak with diffidence. But I cannot think it would be right in principle, for such reasons as these, to deny to non-Europeans a share in the government of their country. Nor do I think it would be wise. It is dangerous for the Church to allow itself to be too closely identified with any government, and particularly so in the case of a colonial government, differing in race from the great majority of the people of the country. The non-Europeans are going to win their place sooner or later—nothing can stop it—and, if the Church had tried to hinder it, there would be far greater reason for the Provost's fears.

But this is not really a racial question at all, as posed by the Provost. The members of an all-European government can be of any religion or none. The African and Asian members of a multi-racial government could be Christian; and, in the case of the former, one would certainly expect that some of them would be, since so much African education has been in the hands of the missions. The Provost's question seems therefore to relate to whether there should not be a religious test for participation in government, and that lies outside the scope of my book.

Yours sincerely,

G. W. Broomfield.

89, Mount Nod Road,
London, S.W.16.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I was encouraged to find in your January issue a letter in reply to Dr Mascall's curious and disturbing argument in his letter in November to the effect that priesthood is reserved to the male sex because it is *coherent* with the fact that Jesus of Nazareth was a male

individual. If this is the kind of argument on which opponents of the ministry of women have to depend, then their case is weak indeed. Surely Dr Mascall is on the right lines with regard to this question when he writes elsewhere in his letter: "The fundamental fact about the two sexes is not that one is superior to the other, but that they are different." The question is whether men and women are so made by God that there are certain callings and activities which are *contra naturam* for one sex or the other, and it is on this ground that arguments for and against the ministry of women must be joined.

But if we follow Dr Mascall's other and main line of argument we shall reach some strange conclusions. Surely biblical and catholic theology has never asserted that God became a man, but that he became Man, as Dr Mascall of course stresses when he writes "human nature as such and not merely male human nature has been redeemed and renewed by the Incarnation of God the Word". But whatever "the scandal of particularity" which was necessary to this Incarnation may mean, it surely must not be pressed to mean, from any point of view, that "the Incarnation exalts the male sex above the female or the female above the male". "In Christ Jesus is neither male nor female"; not *man*hood but humanity was taken by the Word of God; human nature is neither male human nature nor female human nature; man *and* woman, neither alone, make up what we understand by human nature. A Kelham friend of mine took for his Lenten reading one year the sermons of Robertson of Brighton, and summed up his experience of them with the words, "A Robertson a day keeps the devil away."A study of Robertson's two sermons on "The Glory of the Virgin Mother" and "The Glory of the Divine Son (*Sermons by the Rev. F. W. Robertson,* Second Series, Paul Trench Trubner and Co, 1889) still provides us with stern warnings against *ex parte* theories about the meaning of the Incarnation and gives sound reasons for the prevalence of mariolatry in the Roman Communion and the absence of mariology in the Anglican.

Yours faithfully,

† Glyn Swansea and Brecon.

Ely Tower, Brecon.

Dr Mascall writes:

"In her letter in the January number of Theology Miss Thrall rightly said that 'the distinction between Jew and Gentile was to the Biblical writers of no less fundamental importance than the distinction between male and female'. And both these distinctions are transcended in Christ. But it does not follow from this that both distinctions are transcended *in the same way*. If the primitive Church had thought so, it would no doubt have extended the priesthood to women as it did to Gentiles. If we wish to find out the precise ways in which the two distinctions are transcended, all we can do is to look at the practice of the primitive Church; this is why I based my argument upon *coherence* and not upon *entailment*, though Miss Thrall does not refer to this.

"Furthermore, transcendence is not abolition. In spite of the fact that the distinction between Jew and Gentile is transcended in the Church, the Jew and the Gentile have different theological functions in the dispensation of God, as St Paul was at pains to make clear. So have men and women. And the distinction between Jew and Gentile is a different distinction from the distinction between man and woman, even although both distinctions are transcended without being abolished in the Christian Church.

"Miss Thrall conceives of the Incarnation in terms of humiliation and condescension rather than of exaltation, reserving the exaltation of human nature for the Resurrection and the Ascension. But are the two notions mutually exclusive? The Athanasian Creed tells us that the Incarnation took place 'not by the conversion of Godhead into flesh, but by the assumption of manhood into God'. Again, Miss Thrall says that 'the Virgin Mary is not termed exalted, but blessed'; is she then excluded from the verse in the Magnificat which proclaims that God has put down the mighty from their thrones and *exalted* them of low degree?

"I would agree with the Bishop of Swansea and Brecon that no conclusive arguments can be based upon *coherence*; this is a plain fact of logic. This is why I directed attention to the quite different arguments of Dr N. P. Williams, to which neither the Bishop nor Miss Thrall refers. However, arguments from coherence, while seldom or never demonstrative, are often illuminating; and what I was trying to do in my letter was not to prove that the Christian priesthood must be limited to men, but to argue that the Church's practice in so limiting it is not entirely arbitrary.

"I find one part of the Bishop's argument difficult to follow. I agree, of course, that it is not masculinity but humanity that is assumed by God the Word. But when the Bishop writes 'Human nature is *neither* male human nature *nor* female human nature; man *and* woman, *neither alone*, make up what we understand by human nature' (italics partly mine), he seems to be contradicting himself in two successive statements, implying (*sit venia verbis*) first that our Lord ought to be asexual, and then that he ought to be hermaphrodite. Is there *no* significance in the fact that the Incarnate Lord is male and not female? And that, while he had no human father, he has a human mother? (The Bishop's second assertion ['Man and woman, neither alone, make up what we understand by human nature'] appears, in fact, in a somewhat disquieting way, in the arguments of some modern Roman Catholic theologians for the universal mediatorship of our Lady as Coredemptrix. They argue that a redemption worked out solely in a male human nature could not be complete; though they do not take the further step of asserting that Christ and his Mother are involved in the redemptive work on the same level or in the same way.) I can hardly suppose that the Bishop intends to imply that Christ's masculinity is purely accidental, that he might just as well have been a woman as a man, but this would certainly seem to be the outcome of the Bishop's assertions.

"May I plead, in conclusion, that in the interests of ecumenical understanding, the word 'Mariolatry' is better avoided? Whatever distortions, either of doctrine or of practice, are to be found in certain sections of the Roman Communion, its theologians are unanimous that the Mother of God is not to be venerated with *latreia*, but with *hyperdulia*, and it is unkind to accuse our Christian brethren of something which they would unhesitatingly repudiate as idolatrous."

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed. THEOLOGY.]

"A MODERN DEFENCE OF INFALLIBILITY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Dr Hanson is welcome to demolish—which he does, of course, admirably—"the theory of an original, authentic, oral tradition", etc. I do not hold it, and I am only too glad to see how nearly in fact we do agree: Dr Hanson could hardly have described more winningly what is meant by "the living mind of the Church"; and he can take it that the Roman theory of Tradition which "seemed to approximate" to the Anglican is the one to be reckoned with. Only we would like to point out that the canonicity (and inspiration) of Scripture is not something we can know from Scripture itself.

Rightly again Dr Hanson insists that our Lord did not give instructions about infant baptism, but left this for the Church to decide upon when the time came and under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, it still seems to me that the difference between Baptists and Anglicans is *doctrinal*. The latter hold (with us) that the Sacrament is of such a nature that it can be effectively administered to infants. This the Baptists deny, and there you have a radical disagreement over "a constituent element of Christian revelation".

Anglicans will, I am sure, recognize that if our Marian doctrines appear strange to them, their denial of these—in defiance (we feel) of Scripture and the Fathers!—is no less puzzling to us. Nor should they be disposed to think such long-held doctrines necessarily false because they have only been recently defined and by Popes of Rome at that. Anglicans did, after all, retain a certain tenderness for the Mother of God which is lacking to the rest of the "Reformed". (I like especially showing Irish-Americans in Oxford the statue over the porch of St Mary-the-Virgin's.) Nowadays the Protestant wind is blowing strongly again, but however bracing this may be it should not be allowed to blight that garden enclosed in the Church of England where Our Lady is loved and honoured. I hope that Dr Mascall's plea for an Anglican Mariology will perhaps bear fruit in THEOLOGY.

Yours faithfully,
H. D. HANSHELL, S.J.

BEAUMONT COLLEGE.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Inaugural Lecture. By C. F. D. Moule. C.U.P. 2s. 6d.

AN IDIOM-BOOK OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By C. F. D. Moule. C.U.P. 25s.

Professor Moule's inaugural lecture is an encouraging document. It reveals an interest in New Testament language at a time when fewer men are making themselves expert in it. After a review of various studies in this subject since the time of WH the lecturer goes on to discuss features of New Testament Greek, the use of the article, forms of the relative, choice of words, and tenses. His final point is an important one. "It seems to me, therefore—and here I reach my last point—that whatever progress in the field of New Testament language and idioms may be hoped for is likely to lie not least in the direction of a more systematic and comprehensive *comparative* study of the language and style of different writings within the New Testament" (pp. 23 f.). In illustration of this we may remark that we have no such study of the syntax and style of the Pauline Epistles. An admirable example of what can be done is to be found in C. H. Turner's papers on Marcan usage in *J.T.S.*, xxv–xxix.

To *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* we look for the application of some of the views mentioned in the inaugural lecture. The book is distinguished by a knowledge of the New Testament in Greek. The author has read his Greek Testament time and again, has pondered its grammatical features and has given us many useful references. His interest in "a more systematic and comprehensive *comparative* study of the language and style of different writings within the New Testament" is shown, for example, in the remarks on *πρό* and *σύν* and on mannerisms. Individual uses might, however, have been noted more fully. Mark uses the imperfect perhaps four times as often as Matthew. It is important for the understanding of passages like the trial scene in Mark 14 to know whether the two evangelists are using the imperfect in just the same way or whether in Mark it is sometimes merely a general past tense. Again, has the perfect in John the same force as it has in the other Gospels? Chantraine's discussion of the perfect in Hellenistic Greek in his *Histoire du Parfait Grec* may be used to illuminate questions such as this.

This mention of Chantraine raises another issue. The philologists can be allowed to do more for the students of the Greek Testament. Professor Moule implies that the rule about prohibitions in Greek (pp. 20 f.) is something that wants explaining. A reference to Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, 212–16, will give the student a clue to its understanding. The papyri might have been cited more often. It is true that we could use them more easily if we had an equivalent of Mayser's *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* for the Roman period, but, as it is, there are several studies of the papyri of the Empire which give us some

assistance. The non-literary papyri enable us, more than any other texts, to observe the movement of the language and to learn what is happening in it from century to century. Thus we can see some particles and prepositions going out of use, new ones appearing, and others developing new uses.

Professor Moule has rightly stressed the importance of studying the characteristic style of each writer. It is also important to observe the standards of taste. For example, in the first century the historic present was used at one extreme by the atticists in their imitation of the ancient models and at the other by writers of little or no literary pretensions, like the author of Mark (cf. the G recension of the *Life of Aesop*). Midway between them, writers of good *Koine* Greek in genral avoid the idiom (cf. Eriksson, *Das Präsens Historicum in der nachklassischen Griechischen Historiographie*).

Mark is important in another way. With the LXX it presented the early Church with models of language and style whose influence can be seen not only in Matthew and Luke but also in Acts and, in moderation, even in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. This Biblical style and its distinctive features are often important for the exposition of the text. For example, unlike Greek prose in general, the Gospels and Acts have a dominant order of words in the sentence. This gives us a pointer to the punctuation of passages like Mark 2. 15 f,. 13. 9 f. Combined with an analysis of the textual variants it helps us to unravel the puzzle at Mark 2. 21.

Professor Moule has done well to use the British and Foreign Bible Society's Greek Testament of 1904 for his text. For the philologist it is probably the most satisfactory one in being at the moment. Nor does he neglect to refer to the manuscripts. Still more can be done in this direction. For example, εἷς as an indefinite article should probably be read at Mark 11. 13 and ἄνθρωπος, used in the same way, at Matt. 9. 32, 13. 45, 19. 3. θέλειν with the co-ordinate subjunctive should be restored at Mark 9. 5, 15. 12. We might have had a little more on this idiom. It is interesting to compare Professor Moule's rewriting of Matthew in the paratactic style (p. 173) with some of the variants in Legg's edition of this Gospel.

There are some points on which the author does not convince me. I doubt the use of εἰς with the accusative as "equivalent to a pure dative" (p. 69). The instances quoted can, and probably should, be taken in a local sense with εἰς with accusative replacing ἐν with the dative. This is probably the explanation of διακονεῖν, διακονία εἰς, 1 Pet. 4. 10, Rom. 15. 31, cf. Acts 12. 25. πιστεύειν εἰς remains a problem. The first meaning suggested for Gal. 2. 14 (p. 53) does not square with the evidence.[1] ὀρθοποδεῖν is a verb of motion used metaphorically and πρός has its normal meaning of "towards". It may be noted that except for one or two phrases Matthew and Mark use the simple dative and not πρός with the accusative after verbs of saying and the like. At Mark 12. 12 the meaning is different. John and Luke–Acts use both constructions.

[1] *Neutestmentliche Studien für Bultmann*, 269–74.

Professor Moule refers "to the new language whose origin is associated with the rise of Alexander". Evidence suggests that the *Koine* was already in being. Early forms of it are used by Xenophon, Aeneas Tacticus (B.C. *c.* 350), and Aristotle.[1] The triumph of Alexander was the triumph of the *Koine*, not its origin.

Finally, if Professor Moule's book goes into a second edition, and we hope it will, can the treatment of some points be enlarged beyond the cursory reference they now receive and the lists of examples be greatly increased? As Denniston wrote: "The reader should be enabled to *bathe* in examples" (*The Greek Particles*[2], vi). The reference to Deissmann on page 14 may be to *Paulus*[2], 153. His readers will be grateful to the author for a stimulating book. Those who use it to brush up their New Testament Greek will find their knowledge of the language less rusty at the end of it.

The Queen's College, Oxford. G. D. Kilpatrick.

Der Gegenwärtige Stand der Entmythologisierungsdebatte. By Hans-Werner Bartsch. Herbert Reich, Evangelischer Verlag. DM. 4.80.

Kerygma und Mythos. Band III. Edited by Hans-Werner Bartsch. Herbert Reich, Evangelischer Verlag. DM. 6.00.

Le Message Chrétien et le Mythe. By L. Malevez, S.J. Desclée de Brouwer. 80 Belgian francs.

The demythologizing controversy continues to rage in Germany, and grows increasingly bewildering to the English-speaking reader. The first of these volumes presents a conspectus of the major contributions to the discussion, mainly on the negative and critical side, during the last decade. In this volume Dr Bartsch steps forward no longer as a reporter but as an advocate for the defence. He complains that, whereas during the period 1941–5 the discussion was being conducted as a domestic controversy within the Church, it has now become a battle waged by the Church and her orthodox theologians against Bultmann as an outsider and near-heretic. Bultmann is accused of "reducing" the substance of the Christian proclamation. This accusation, claims Bartsch, is unfounded: Bultmann is not reducing the kerygma; he is seeking to interpret it *in toto* as a minister of the Church. And it is nonsense for his critics to defend the "objective truth" (*objective Tatsächlichkeit*) of the doctrines of the faith, for "objective" means that they are verifiable to historical research or rational argument, whereas they are confessions of faith. One cannot help feeling that the critics and Bartsch are on different wave-lengths. By "objective" Bartsch means verifiable to observation as opposed to accessible to faith alone, while the critics mean by it "outside of and anterior to its acceptance by the believer": both sides really agree that the truth of the kerygma is accessible only to faith. Whether Bultmann really has a place for an objective (in the

[1] Compare especially Hunter's edition of Aeneas, xlii–lxxxii. See also Rutherford, *The New Phrynichus*, and Richards, *Xenophon and Others*.

sense of *extra me*) act of God in Christ will be discussed later. What seems to be undeniable is that, contrary to his intention, he does in fact eliminate from that act of God many of its traditional constituent elements, e.g. the incarnation, exaltation and heavenly session of Christ as distinct moments in the redemptive act. Bartsch would claim that Bultmann is interpreting them, which is necessary because they are expressed in mythological language. But Bultmann takes them as mythological expressions, not of distinct moments in the redemptive act, but of the single saving event of the cross. We may grant that the language in which the incarnation, etc., are expressed is derived from contemporary Jewish or Gnostic mythology. But for all that they point to distinct moments of the one great act of God, and are not merely interpretative of one moment in that act, viz. the cross. By treating them as such, Bultmann does appear in fact to eliminate rather than to interpret them, and the complaints of his orthodox critics are understandable, to say the least.

Bartsch is at pains to commend demythologizing as the ultimate outcome of the work of the form critics, and behind them of Martin Kähler. Between them, we are told, they have demonstrated the impossibility of penetrating behind the Christ of the kerygma to the Jesus of history. Hence the "unprovability" of the kerygma: it cannot be verified by historical criticism, but must be accepted in faith precisely as kerygma, as proclamation and confession. This antithesis between Jesus and Christ, between history and kerygma is the inevitable result of the extreme conclusions of form criticism, which few scholars in this country would be ready to accept without qualification. It is particularly unfortunate that Bartsch (p. 60) should quote Hoskyns in this connexion. For Hoskyns, so far from renouncing the attempt to reach the Jesus of history, believed in fact that he had done so. By demonstrating the degree to which even the smallest fragments of the gospel tradition are impregnated with Christology, he believed he had demonstrated not of course the ultimate truth of the kerygma, but that Jesus interpreted his own history precisely in the same sense in which the kerygma later interpreted it (see *The Riddle of the New Testamnt*, 1931, pp. 249 f.).

It is not surprising that Bartsch complains in the introduction to our second volume that the demythologizing controversy has "gone sour". With this feeling he turns hopefully for new light to a recent contribution of the philosopher Karl Jaspers. Jaspers does not spare Bultmann. He claims, says Jaspers, to be a theologian. Well, then, let him stick to his mythology and leave philosophy alone. Mythology and religion on the one hand and philosophy on the other are equally legitimate and necessary approaches to the mystery of human life. And what a philosophy Bultmann has given us! Heidegger is not every man's meat (is there just a little professional jealousy here?): "The conscience in despair is not the truth of human life in general: it is simply a way in which certain men, perhaps many, but certainly not all men, recognize themselves." A good point. But Jaspers bitterest scorn is reserved for Bultmann's retention of the

unique act of God in Jesus Christ. Here Bultmann comes out in his true colours: at bottom he is orthodox and illiberal!—pejorative terms denoting the antithesis to the open-mindedness of the philosopher. This is almost the same gravamen as that laid against Bultmann by the Swiss neo-liberal theologian Fritz Buri, in his essay in this volume (cf. his earlier essay, "Entmythologisierung oder Entkerygmatisierung der Theologie", in *Kerygma und Mythos*, Vol. II, 1952). Buri demands that the kerygma of an act of God (not only its mythological expression) should be eliminated, and the kerygma deflated to a mere understanding of human existence achieved in the decision of faith, without the necessity of an objective act of God in history to bring it about by socratic midwifery.

This agreement of the critics on the left is highly important for an understanding of Bultmann's position. The critics of the right have frequently contended that Bultmann does not really leave room for an objective act of God in Christ. "Everything happens in the consciousness" (Thielicke, see *Kerygma and Myth* [E.T.], p 148). In what sense, if any, does Bultmann allow for an act of God in Christ? Father Malevez wrestles with this problem in his admirable exposition of Bultmann's thought. (I know of no clearer and more impartial study of Bultmann's theology: it is written *sine ira et studio* to a degree which is really remarkable, and compares favourably with anything written on the critical side, whether in this country or on the continent.) There is a certain ambiguity in Bultmann's treatment of the objective act of God, which arises from a prior ambiguity in his definition of mythology. But his dominant conception of mythology does leave room for an intervention of God in history, and therefore does not require its demythologization. But this act of God, Malevez maintains, is the *notification* of our redemption, not its accomplishment.

Father Malevez's book bears the *imprimatur*, so it is only to be expected that it should end with a critical rejection of Bultmann's final position. Yet he maintains that we can learn from Bultmann to seek the existential relevance, the relevance to human life, of the objective Christian faith; and he welcomes Bultmann's reaction from the extreme Barthian rejection of the point of contact. The Gospel must speak to our plight, or it will speak over our heads.

In conclusion, we might say that the impoverishment of Bultmann's Christian position is not merely due to his forcing the kerygma on to the Procrustes' bed of Heideggerian existentialism, but has far deeper roots in the impoverishment of the Lutheran tradition as such. Justification by faith alone is a blessed truth within the context of the whole richness of Catholic faith and life, but when it is isolated from the objective act of God, not only on the cross but also in the incarnation, exaltation and heavenly pleading of Christ, and from the richness of the sacramental and devotional life, Christianity is reduced to the shadow of a shade. As Malevez aptly complains, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him."

LAMPETER. REGINALD H. FULLER.

THE MISSION AND ACHIEVEMENT OF JESUS. By R. H. Fuller. S.C.M. Press. 8s.

In dedicating his book to "the revered memory of my teachers Edwyn Clement Hoskyns and John Martin Creed", Professor Fuller is willing to risk the recriminations of disappointed readers whose appetites he has thus chosen to whet. Let it therefore be said at once that *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* entirely lives up to the tradition of Cambridge theological scholarship. Perhaps it would be an exaggeration to say that it does for the fifties what *The Riddle of the New Testament* did for the thirties or William Manson's *Jesus the Messiah* for the forties—its 120 pages are slighter than those two great books and the climate of opinion no longer needs to be converted to this kind of view—but only a very insular critic would dare to say there was no need for such a third book and only a very captious one would deny that Professor Fuller has successfully met the need.

The Mission and Achievement of Jesus may be regarded as an extended comment on pages 1–53 of the first volume of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*, and although translations of Bultmann and critical essays about his work already serve the English student much more satisfactorily than his predecessor who tried to come to grips with the *Religionsgeschichtliche* school, the present book will be indispensable. Professor Fuller goes some way towards accepting Bultmann's thesis—he agrees that Jesus announced the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God, and this conclusion is reached after a valuable examination in Chapter II of Dr Dodd's theory of "realized eschatology" (without however taking into account some apparent modifications made in Dr Dodd's *The Coming of Christ* in 1951). But Bultmann's fatal weakness is that he cannot offer an explanation why an eschatological prophet who proclaimed the nearness of the kingdom and the coming of the Son of Man, a figure distinct from himself, should have deliberately gone to die in Jerusalem; nor why the death of Jesus (unlike, for example, that of the Baptist) was taken by some to be a pre-eminently saving act of God. Fuller is able to show that Jesus looked on his death as the means by which the kingdom should be inaugurated and that the predictions of the Passion, for whose authenticity he convincingly argues, imply that in the near future, and as a result of his death, Jesus will be exalted as Son of Man. He whose life was indeed "un-Messianic" (Bultmann's word) in the sense that he made no Messianic claim for himself until the crucifixion was upon him, could rightly be called Messiah after the Resurrection, for Jesus himself had provided the raw materials for the Church's Christological confession. "The Christology of the Church is the confession that God *has acted* eschatologically in Jesus. The 'Christology' of Jesus . . . is the confession that God is *in the process of accomplishing*, and is about to complete, his eschatological act in him."

It may be of interest to record Mr Fuller's opinions on particular matters. He accepts the existence of a (written?) Q; he is with the

R.S.V. and against the late Théo Preiss (in the next Study in Biblical Theology) in preferring the shorter text of Luke 22. 19 ff.; but with Preiss in regarding the Last Supper as an anticipation of the Passover meal. "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence" (passive) in the resistance encountered by its proclamation, and the men of violence, resisting the message, *snatch away* the word from others who might hear it.

In Professor Fuller's view Jesus was "mistaken" in supposing that the interval between the cross and the final consummation would be short. This seems to be a judgment of value going beyond the author's self-appointed limits of the historian. He himself accepts the psychological explanation of Cullmann, but whatever his explanation of a "mistake" on a matter upon which Jesus claimed to be speaking authoritatively, should not this illusion have been put, where after all it has been frequently put since 1906, among the items in Jesus' own thinking about which we have to decide whether or not the Church drew valid inferences; i.e. as one of the vital "raw materials of Christology" (Chapter IV), rather than as a minor qualification in the very last paragraph?

The reviewer may have misunderstood Professor Fuller on this last point, but whether that is so or not, he would reaffirm that this book is a notable addition to the distinguished series of monographs in which it is No. 12. It should be temporarily banned from the libraries of theological colleges in order that nothing should distract students from possessing their own copies.

Wilfrid Browning.

Cuddesdon College,
Oxford.

Sex, Sin, and Sanctity. By John Langdon-Davies. Victor Gollancz. 16s.

To those whose impressions of Mr Langdon-Davies's views on sexual relation have been based on his book *A Short History of Women*, this latest work from his pen will come as an agreeable surprise. He confesses that twenty-five years ago he was "somewhat guilty of the Briffaultian heresy" that Christianity has been responsible for all that is wrong in the Western attitude to sex and its problems; but he now realizes (would that others did, too!) that this is a superficial and unfounded opinion—and accordingly makes a handsome retraction.

Unfortunately, however, his sincere attempt to vindicate Christianity and the Church leaves much to be desired, and the force of his arguments is weakened by the presuppositions from which he starts. The function of religion in society is, for him, the regulation of natural human desires and the control of man's guilt-feelings through the offer of forgiveness. In the decaying Hellenistic civilization Christianity accomplished this task by imposing upon men precisely the ascetical discipline they really desired. It is unfair, therefore, to blame the Church for giving people what they wanted and for accept-

ing certain inevitable limitations; ". . . the human institution, Christianity, could only do what human nature made possible". It regulated sex (by which Mr Langdon-Davies generally means "coital activity" or "venery") in conformity with the material and spiritual needs of the society which it served.

In this picture one vital element is missing—the Church's conviction that God had declared his will concerning man and woman, and that its task was to proclaim his will and to call people to obey it. To say this is not to deny that in many respects the Church's apprehension of the Divine ordinance for the sexes was imperfect or erroneous, and was necessarily qualified by the limited scientific knowledge of antiquity. Nevertheless, the ordinance stands—and the critical and constructive sections of this book would have been of greater value had Mr Langdon-Davies taken account of theological principles and of recent developments in thought bearing upon sexual relation in its widest sense.

It is this neglect of principles that robs his conclusions of their full value. Mr Langdon-Davies believes that we are heading for a complex emotional revolution, and stresses the importance of a moral revaluation of sexual acts, which he classifies as "sexual", "erotic", and "lustful". Some such revaluation must sooner or later occupy the attention of the moral theologian, and Mr Langdon-Davies has initiated an inquiry which will demand no little courage; but it cannot be said that he has taken us very far—though it is to be hoped that he will have stimulated some discussion. I would submit, however, that already theological attention to the nature of love and marriage has led to the development of a conception of sexual relation much richer and fuller than that towards which he is feeling—and it is regrettable that no echo of this can be heard in this book.

But there is much for which we are grateful to Mr Langdon-Davies. There is an excellent chapter on the sexual ideas of the ancient philosophers, and another both provocative and realistic on Courtly Love (it will be interesting to see whether the experts in this field of study challenge his interpretations); and, on the whole, a refreshing absence of the inaccuracies which so often mar a work of this kind. It is to be hoped that Mr Langdon-Davies will not let his studies of sexual relation end here and that he will acquaint himself with current theological research on the question.

Birmingham. Sherwin Bailey.

SHORTER NOTICES

Thomas Bray. By H. P. Thompson. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

Mr H. P. Thompson has written a useful, if short, biography of a great churchman, Dr Thomas Bray, the founder of the S.P.C.K. and of the S.P.G. He is able to show that Bray's best-known achievements were rooted and grounded in his experience as a parish priest. His activities, both at home and in America, as Bishop Compton's Commissary for Maryland, were the immediate cause of the foundation

of the two societies; but those activities themselves were preceded and succeeded by pastoral ministries first in the country parish of Sheldon, then at St Botolph, Aldgate. It was at Sheldon that he first conceived his interest in the education of clergy and laity and in the proper instruction of youth in catechism and worship. This emphasis on instruction was the *leitmotif* of his life and ministry, in all circumstances, and the basis of his "darling contrivance", the provision of libraries for clergy and laity, for parish and rural deanery. He was a prophetic administrator; he was an inspiring leader under whose aegis the supply of clergy for the colonies grew from a trickle to a stream; he was a persistent negotiator, especially successful in lobbying the members of the Maryland assembly to procure the establishment of the Church of England in the colony; he was a respectable scholar and a voracious reader; above all he was a faithful parish priest, still at the age of sixty-five, Thoresby tells us, gathering round him "young persons". One might have wished that Mr Thompson had given a more extended account of the theological opinions of this representative high church divine. And it would have been of interest if he had printed in an appendix the catalogue of one of Bray's beloved libraries. For instance, the (for him) short list of books recommended for lending libraries in market towns includes, besides the Fathers, works by Pearson, Sherlock, and Stillingfleet; it concludes with "*Compleat Gardener*, by Monsieur Quintine, Fol". Certainly Dr Bray was the complete English parson.

Jesus College, Cambridge. B. D. Till.

You Can Be Healed. By Clifton E. Kew and Clinton J. Kew. New York: Prentice Hall Inc. $2.95.

The Kew brothers, the first of whom is a psychotherapist and the other an Episcopalian minister, write from their experience in clinics attached to two central New York churches. What they have to say mainly concerns the close relation in theory and practice between group therapy and Christian fellowship, but they also use individual therapy and spiritual healing, all in close combination. They are obviously very skilled practitioners and seem to use the different modes of treatment with great discrimination. They explain how they deal with the usual difficulties met in the handling of neurotics and do not seek to evade them. Yet their account seems to make the overcoming of these difficulties easier than other people find it. Hence it is by no means clear how far the great success they have met with is due to their own personalities rather than to the methods they employ.

The book fills a great need in showing ways in which religion and psychology combine, when rightly used, in an integral relationship, and the first-hand case material is an extremely valuable contribution which will be welcomed by all who are interested in pastoral psychology.

R. S. Lee.
Oxford.

How Jesus Christ Saves Men. A study of the Atonement. By Norman L. Robinson. James Clarke and Co. 12s. 6d.

The Vision and Mission of Jesus. A literary and critical investigation into the consistency of the New Testament Vision and Teaching of the Rule of God and into the Origin and Basis of the Christian Mission. By Arthur H. Curtis. T. and T. Clark. 27s.

The coming of Biblical criticism brought with it a drastic change in the way that Christ's person was thought of. He must, it was now contended, have possessed a limited human consciousness, in a real sense intelligible to us. But great changes have also taken place in the way in which his saving work and his message are conceived. To realize this, one has only to read the two books here under review.

How Jesus Christ Saves Men is a straightforward, useful book on the atonement. It is the book of a preacher, with many reiterations of phrase and metaphor, but the author died before his work was finally ready for publication. He knew his subject well, however; and the book does not lose much by its small defects.

Robinson embodies the now familiar position that is both radical and traditional. His whole faith turns on the reality of the reconciliation of man and God in Christ, but he rejects all former theories of the atonement which visualize a transaction in virtue of which mankind is redeemed. Such theories are sub-personal and tend to divide the persons of the Trinity. Even McLeod Campbell and Moberly are not sufficiently detached from the old ideas for this writer. The whole point of the new ethic brought by Jesus is not God demanding satisfaction, but the father of the prodigal going out to reconcile his son. The Cross of Christ is not something that changes God's mind, but the manifestation of God's own suffering love. This theme is now familiar, and one feels that sufficient sympathy is not always accorded to the older theories, which have the Divine holiness as their starting-point. However, Robinson's argument is well stated, and his introductory chapters on the Biblical material are useful summaries. The only practical application which he attempts to work out is the Christian attitude to war, in which he finds himself on the side of pacifism. As Canon Baker suggests in the foreword, it is regrettable that the author did not give more attention to the ways in which Christ's reconciliation is brought into touch with our own souls, for instance through the Holy Communion.

The Vision and Mission of Jesus is a series of studies of the life and teaching of our Lord. The book would be much more effective were it shorter, in clearer English, and with less paraphernalia.

The studies move in the idiom of the Divine confrontation of man. Thus, Christ's ministry opens with his baptism, at which comes his vision or call—as with the Old Testament prophets. At the culmination of the Old Dispensation and the beginning of the New comes the word of "the transcendent God, who in his Son's obedience wills now and henceforth to dwell within man, wholly immanent in his

unutterable transcendence". The church too had its experience of commission, a determinative vision and word—"the Vision of the Jesus whom God raised in his death to the right hand of his saving power". The Temptation stories are in general the key to the relevance of the Lord's mission. They represent the struggle that comes after the vision for total commitment to God. They also, the author thinks, show the way out of the awkward eschatological problem of the New Testament. To the prophetic mind, linear time disappears, and the final end is in a sense present. Christian faith too is at its purest when the consummation is wholeheartedly desired. The book has ample indices.

WARTON. STEWART LAWTON.

AN ESSAY IN CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. By Dom Illtyd Trethowan. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Can we properly speak of a Christian philosophy? We can, in the sense in which Dom Illtyd Trethowan understands the expression. Christian theology assumes certain philosophical positions, and the purpose of this book is to vindicate these on philosophical grounds. The positions with which the author is chiefly concerned are the existence of God, the possibility of our having knowledge of him, and man's moral responsibility.

The book makes us aware of the deep divisions prevailing in the philosophical world, in which different schools of thought have come to speak in different languages. It says much for the author's breadth of outlook that amid this confusion of tongues he is equally at his ease in discussing the views of logical analysts, existentialists, and conventional Thomists.

The destructive part of the argument is directed against the denial of the possibility of metaphysical knowledge by the logical analysts. Dom Illtyd Trethowan has been a careful reader of *Mind*. A valuable part of his achievement here is the removal of some common misconceptions on the part of philosophers of this school. The knowledge of God's existence is not reached by syllogistic deduction; neither is it the result of induction, as if God were in the same category as a scientific hypothesis; it is, we are told, given in experience, and in the analysis and discrimination of experience.

Thus the author favours an Augustinian approach to the question of God's existence, and in the development of this position declares his sympathy with the views of certain existentialist thinkers. This line of thought brings him into conflict with some of the Thomist arguments, which he subjects to searching criticism. But his sympathy with existentialism does not imply any irrationalist tendency. "Theology may be mysterious, but it must always make sense." The approach throughout is an intellectualist one, as may be seen in the discussions on ethics and prayer, yet it is not a narrow intellectualism in the sense of discursive reasoning but includes the notion of union with and participation in that which is known.

It should be remembered that this very useful book is not theology but "a piece of philosophical writing", and therefore it is to be hoped that it will be widely read among philosophers, as well as among those theologians who are interested in the philosophical implications of the Christian faith.

GLASGOW UNIVERSITY. JOHN MACQUARRIE.

IN DER SCHULE PASCALS. By Hans Ehrenberg. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider. N.p.

A study of Pascal by Dr Ehrenberg was promised in his little book on Job, which was reviewed here in November 1953 (THEOLOGY, LVI, No. 401), and already last May the review copy of it had arrived. Perhaps it followed too closely on that of the earlier book. How otherwise account for the mis-spelling of the names of Léon Brunschvicg and H. F. Stewart, both pre-eminent editors of Pascal's writings? for the ascription of an edition of the *Pensées* to Mr T. S. Eliot? and for references to "the Earl of Cherbury" as well as to George Cherbury and Herbert Cherbury alternately? Those may seem trivial slips, although they argue a failure to enter into the atmosphere of recent Pascalian commentary. But in fact they are symptomatic. Dr Ehrenberg has been less happy here than with Job.

Fresh books on Pascal are called for not only to give succeeding generations a fresh exegesis, but also to counteract the effect of foolish attacks. A posthumous fragment by Charles Maurras, the notorious French monarchist who died in 1952, is entitled *Pascal puni*, and the unfulfilled intention was apparently to depict Pascal expiating in Purgatory a rash depreciation of human reason. Dr Ehrenberg does not help to show how preposterous is this innuendo by saying that Pascal was perhaps not so much anti-rational or irrational as a-rational. Pascal never decries reason; he simply points out that reason is not enough. Maurras, we are told, was under the further delusion that Pascal, in despising reason, prepared the vogue of successive anti-intellectualist philosophers since his day. The late Paul Hazard is surely more to the point in saying, in his newly translated *European Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, that the Church was over-hasty in condemning Jansenism, for Jansenism might have proved the most solid obstacle to Deism. It is to Dr Ehrenberg's credit that he sides with M. Hazard. He recalls that as a philosopher Pascal was the enemy of the philosophies of his day; he saw whither they tended. Unfortunately Dr Ehrenberg does not stop there.

He also claims that Pascal was a promoter of the Confessional Church, the rediscoverer of the Jews, and father of the ecumenical movement. Those are not claims he is able to support with persuasiveness. He does, however, advance them entertainingly. So too in these pages as in those of his Job he is repeatedly stimulating.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

PETERBOROUGH.

By Faith Alone. The life of Martin Luther. By W. J. Kooiman, translated by Bertram Lee Wolf. Lutterworth Press. 18s.

John Wesley. By Martin Schmidt. Band I, Die Zeit vom 17. Juni 1703 bis 24. Mai 1738. Gotthelf Verlag, Zürich/Frankfurt. N.p.

Kraft und Innigkeit. Hans Ehrenberg als Gabe der Freundschaft im 70. Lebensjahr ueberreicht. Verlag Lambert Schneider, Heidelberg. N.p.

British and Irish writers are frequently guilty of ignorant defamation, and of still more ignorant praise of Martin Luther. Professor Kooiman has written in Dutch the best short life of Luther that has appeared for many years. Mr Wolf's translation should help English readers to form a just estimate of the great man. Save for a single awkward phrase on p. 209 (line 11, "Unto thee . . . I pray thee"), his version seems very readable and flowing.

The biography itself is a sort of mosaic of well-chosen and skilfully woven anecdotes and quotations. The general effect is not unlike that of Boswell. Luther was in some respects not unlike Samuel Johnson. He was also moody, most eloquent when angry, self-willed, yet generally right, apparently undisciplined, yet with a great control of his strong nature. Like Boswell, if from a greater distance, Professor Kooiman loves his hero well enough to paint him warts and all, with his peasant coarseness, his rough but playful humour, his oddities and mistakes (Philip of Hesse's bigamy is given full treatment), but also his fearlessness and outspoken honesty. Luther's kindly treatment of Carlstadt contrasts with Calvin's behaviour towards Servetus. Professor Kooiman regards Luther as a prophet with no great gift for organization, and so acquits him of blame for some things he initiated in good faith and which were sometimes perverted by those who came after him.

Martin Schmidt's first volume of his biography of Wesley—the first serious and scholarly one, apparently, in German—is tougher reading. It has 59 pages of notes to 273 of text. But it is shrewd and interesting. We see sides of Wesley we had not thought of before—his dissenting ancestors, his very considerable scholarship, and the books he read. We are reminded of the strong Germanic influences—how the reading of Luther's *Romans* brought about his conversion, how the meeting with Lutheran pietists and Moravians helped to form his mind, and contributed to the organization of class-meetings—we also learn how he impressed the Germans he met.

I could detect only one minor slip. *The Whole Duty of Man* is called a "beliebtes *puritanisches* erbauungsschrift"—actually of course it was a product of Royalist Anglicanism under the Cromwellian persecution. One makes such mistakes when one deals with an unfamiliar literature. Let me take the beam out of my own eye, and confess that in a recent article on the Protevangelium in this journal, I confused Johann Gerhard the dogmatician with Paul Gerhardt the hymn-writer.

We had realized Wesley was a bit silly in his behaviour with women. Dr Schmidt brings out the full silliness while vindicating

Wesley's honesty and innocence in his relations with "Miss Sophy" in Georgia.

Altogether these two biographies do what every biography should do, they make us feel we know the character (including the faults) of Luther and Wesley; and at the same time they make us respect and venerate the real man, and vow to take him more seriously than before.

Kraft und Innigkeit is a tribute paid by his friends to Dr Hans Ehrenberg on his seventieth birthday. It consists of miscellaneous essays in German. There are two contributions in English. Montgomery Belgion reviews Dr Ehrenberg's book, *Hiob, der Existentialist*, and says of the author "May he be destined to keep a good many happy birthdays more". Gordon Rupp indulges in a sort of Franciscan paean. "Thanks be to God for our brother Ehrenberg . . . for his steadfastness in faith and his courage in exile, and for his sense of humour, for his gift of friendship and the catholicity with which he collected friends and scholars out of many communions . . . for the gallantry of returning to Germany after the war, and the faithfulness to duty to ones own people. . . ." All who know Hans Ehrenberg will say Amen.

COSSLETT QUIN.

NARRAGHMORE RECTORY,
CO. KILDARE.

A SCIENTIST OF THE INVISIBLE. By A. P. Shepherd. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

WAYS TO PSYCHIC HEALTH. By Alphonse Maeder. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

YOU WILL SURVIVE DEATH. By Sherwood Eddy. Omega Press. 12s. 6d.

Dr A. P. Shepherd introduces his readers to the life and work of Rudolph Steiner, who died in 1925. Steiner's early training was scientific and his formative years were those during which German thought was absorbing and developing Darwinian ideas, especially under the leadership of Haeckel, whom Steiner knew. It is very difficult, however, to find many traces of scientific method in the system which he produced. There is a chapter in Dr Shepherd's book on "The Origin and Destiny of Man", in which he claims that one of the most important elements in Steiner's spiritual science is his account of the origin and destiny of man.

Steiner asserted that, when the body perishes, it leaves behind spirit forces which are impressed upon the "spiritual groundwork of the world. . . . These imperishable traces of everything immaterial are called in occult science the 'Akashic Records' ".

Steiner stated that he was in intimate touch with those records and possessed the ability to read them with certainty and in extreme detail. He gives his account of the evolution of the world and man at great length in several books. The evolution of the world itself he looks upon as the expression of the creative activity of

spiritual beings. He works his way through the ancient civilizations down to the time when our Lord, whom he regarded as unique, came into the world, and he deals with all that has happened since.

Steiner also firmly believed in the process of reincarnation, and there are many traces in his writing of the beliefs which led him into the Theosophical Society and which he retained until the end.

Another example of Steiner's detailed and dogmatic assertions is given by Dr Shepherd on p. 176: "The head, with the sense organs and the nervous system, is the centre of the thinking. The limbs, with the processes of digestion and metabolism, are the centre of the activity of the will. Between them, the chest system, with the principles of the circulation of the blood and the intake and outflow of the breath, is the seat of feeling."

Steiner asserted that he possessed special powers of perception. Others who do not have this must take his writings on trust. It is obviously far-fetched to call this science and there are no adequate reasons why such a system should be accepted. We have the right to ask for more evidence and we cannot accept a system as science simply because it is labelled as such. Steiner still has his followers. Perhaps one reason for this is that there are many in the world to-day for whom the categories of science are not sufficient. Other categories are equally valid and ultimately more important. Steiner's real contribution was a steady assertion of this. His mistake was to map this vast country far too definitely, and in his system which he called Anthroposophy he made man too much its centre.

Dr Maeder, a Zürich psychiatrist, gives the history of fifteen people who came to him for treatment. There are no examples of deep analysis, for Dr Maeder confines himself to brief psychotherapy, which may mean from two to ten sessions. He describes the cases as cures, though it would have been interesting to know more than is given of their after history. Dr Maeder began his medical practice as a convinced positivist, but became converted to Christianity and, for twenty years, has been associated with the Group Movement of Dr Buckman. On the strength of this he has a section on "Psychotherapy and Pastoral Care".

Ways to Psychic Health is superficial, containing little more than what one might call "common-sense psychology". Dr Maeder gives the impression of being a kindly physician in whom his patients can confide and, largely through unburdening themselves, they find release. He believes that much anxiety, depression and conditions of general malaise are due to the existence of guilt and a troubled conscience and that, with such cases, much can be done by the right kind of pastoral care. But the only kind he mentions is that found in the Oxford Group Movement. Many of the problems with which Dr Maeder deals belong to the realm of traditional pastoral care. Perhaps it is to help those whose vocation it is to give this that Dr Maeder designed his book. We could have wished, however, that he had been more catholic in his treatment of pastoral care.

Dr Sherwood Eddy, as a popular writer, has in the past covered the surface of the world extensively, and in his latest book he faces

billions of other worlds. He describes how a Quaker friend first interested him in Spiritualism and follows this by a history of the great spiritualists of the past and then considers the type of experiment on extra-sensory perception carried out by Dr J. B. Rhine and others. Dr Eddy also gives an account of much that he has seen of the psychic healing of disease. The remainder of the book describes different types of séances in which he has taken part.

Dr Sherwood Eddy was undoubtedly honest in his searching, but the accounts given in his book, like all those which we have so far encountered, are extremely disappointing as far as their quality is concerned.

YETMINSTER. H. L. PHILP.

INTRODUCTION À L'ESTHÉTIQUE. By Maurice Nédoncelle. Presses Universitaires de France. 240 frs.

A really determined philosopher will stifle beauty with verbiage in half a dozen pages, and those whose pleasure it is to seek aesthetic encounter at first hand and who are aware how almost painful its delights can sometimes be, probably seldom read books about the subject. Professor Nédoncelle—of Strasburg University—writes from an unmistakable depth of personal experience of the arts and well repays the reading. His approach to aesthetics is the more enlightening for his use of theological terms (incidentally his other writings include works on religious philosophy in Great Britain since 1850, seventeenth-century Anglo-Catholicism, and the thought of Newman and of von Hügel). Thus he discusses what he calls the demiurgic and the eschatological aspects of art, using the Pygmalion myth to illuminate the former. From time to time, he says, the artist finds forms and choice of material imposed, as it were, upon him and becoming the transparent body of a living idea. Galatea comes to life before the sculptor's astonished eyes. It is the function of works of art to declare to all comers the immanence of the infinite in the finite, testifying "that a world of values exists superior to ours and embodied in them". But he has little taste for the experimental posturings and abstractions of some modern artists. He demands "un primat de l'épiderme". Pygmalion does not fashion a monstrous being, inconceivable on this planet, but a woman of the same species as all women; though by grace of his inspiration he surpasses in her the mediocrities of experience.

The eschatological aspect lies, for the author, in the artistic quest of a transcendant order and its attempted realization here below, yet with roots plunged into the earth from which the work of art never completely detaches itself. There is an attendant discipline and "it is necessary to importune the senses with a beggar's obstinacy until they release their hidden gold". In its eschatological character art finds place for its own consideration of imperfection and evil—as in the *Divine Comedy*. It both offers "a positive ontological communica-

tion", and similarly conveys faith in an eternal perfection, provoking the effort "boldly to construct what only the most piercing eye half perceives". He thinks it, however, much nearer to religious prophecy than to mysticism.

There is quiet amusement here and there—"Look at the conductor of an orchestra or an organist at work. They fancy themselves Jupiter"—and in short this is a lucid and suggestive essay which the interested English reader is likely to enjoy.

STOKE D'ABERNON. JOHN H. L. WATERSON.

MASTERS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By M. L. Loane. Church Book Room Press. 12s. 6d.

This book has been issued well in advance of the anniversaries to which it is meant to draw attention, namely the fourth centenary of the martyrdoms of some of the great leaders of the English Reformation. Canon Loane has written in a very readable style and, while he is covering the same period in history in his five biographical sketches, he avoids repeating himself.

The author is sympathetic to his subjects. These are Bilney, of whom we know comparatively little, but who was responsible for Latimer's conversion; Tyndale, whose biblical labours have exercised so great an influence; Latimer, about whose sermons perhaps more might have been written; Ridley, who is seldom granted his full place in the theological leadership of the Reformation; and then Cranmer. To him, as is historically correct, Principal Loane devotes a longer chapter. His scholarship, gentleness, mental turmoil, and ultimate triumph are all well brought out.

The book has definite value in making us realize the cost at which our heritage was secured and the object of the Reformation, that God might have his honour properly secured to him.

VANCOUVER, B.C. H. F. WOODHOUSE.

PAUL COUTURIER: APÔTRE DE L'UNITÉ CHRÉTIENNE. Vitte. 480 frs.

This book consists of appreciations of the work of Abbé Couturier of Lyons for Christian unity by Roman Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants.

They convey that strong impression of a saintly man of prayer, which all who met him must have felt.

Inflexibly loyal as he was to the Roman Church, he had a deep appreciation of the graces of other Christian communions. His great work was to increase the bonds of friendship and of prayer between Christian people as they interceded for the unity of the Church "when Christ wills and as Christ wills".

Typical of his methods was his taking a Calvinist pastor to speak with the nuns of a Roman Catholic convent. As they left, the Abbé said, "This has been a good day." The pastor asked him what exactly he meant, and received the reply, "Yes, a good day, because

your visit has made them feel the pain of our divisions: previously they did not feel this tragedy."

OXFORD. S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF 1 KINGS 17–19 AND 21–22. By Norman H. Snaith. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

This is a book for beginners in Hebrew, and as such a welcome addition to the all too few volumes available in this field. The selected chapters are often the first Hebrew text studied by those seeking to learn the original language of the Old Testament. It is to be hoped that further parts of the Hebrew Bible will be similarly treated to encourage a revival of the study of the Hebrew language.

ST DAVIDS. C. WITTON-DAVIES.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BEAUCHESNE ET SES FILS: Joseph Huby, S.J., *L'Évangile et les Évangiles* (n.p.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Austin Farrer, *St Matthew and St Mark* (25s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Paul King Jewett, *Emil Brunner's Concept of Revelation* (18s.).

GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY, ROME: Joanne Lisowski, *The Teaching and Practice of Penance in the Church of England* (n.p.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: Douglas Webster, *Truly Called: four studies of the training of men for the ministry in the Church overseas* (1s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York, *The Claims of the Church of England* [shortened edition; the original edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, October 1947, p. 388] (4s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: O. Hallesby, *Religious or Christian?* (6s.).

LONGMANS: E. J. Bicknell, *The Thirty-nine Articles* [revised and brought up to date by the Bishop of Oxford] (21s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: J. G. Davies, *Social Life of Early Christians* (17s. 6d.).

METHUEN: Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (42s.).

MONKTONS PUBLICATIONS: H. P. W. Burton, *Weavers of Webs* (10s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Felix Timmermans, *The Perfect Joy of St Francis* (10s. 6d.); H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth* (42s.); *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (a symposium) (7s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *The New Oxford School Bible* [including the *Apocrypha*] (9s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Temptation* (3s.); Norman K. Gottwald, *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* (8s.); Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (16s.); Lord Percy of Newcastle, *From the Concert of Europe to the United Nations* (1s.); Théo Preiss, *Life in Christ* (7s.).

SCRIBNERS: P. M. Dawley, *John Whitgift and the English Reformation* ($3.00).

SHEED AND WARD: F. J. Sheed (Ed.), *Born Catholics* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: James Wareham, *First Books* (a revised edition of ten booklets formerly published by the A.P.R.) (6d. each).

TYNDALE PRESS: Edward J. Young, *Studies in Isaiah* (12s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

AFTER THIS MANNER

Vol. 2
Oblation and Communion
12*s.* 6*d. net*

A book of devotions by an Anglican Religious. In a Foreword, Bishop Hubback, former Metropolitan of India, writes, "As one privileged to use these devotions for many years, I commend them with all my heart."

S·P·C·K

INTERNATIONAL VACATION COURSES

AT ST AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY, THE CENTRAL COLLEGE OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

July 11-23, *July* 25-*August* 6, *August* 8-20
1955

LECTURERS:

Canon C. K. Sansbury (*Warden*), Dr E. R. Fairweather (*Toronto*), the Archdeacon of Lincoln, Dr W. E. Kan (*Tokyo*), the Revd. P. Lillingston (*Nigeria*), Dr Pierson Parker (*New York*), Dr J. A. T. Robinson (*Cambridge*), Dr R. H. L. Slater (*Montreal*) and the Fellows of the College.

Details from the
SECRETARY OF THE SUMMER COURSES,
ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY,
KENT

C. K. Barrett

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN

63s. net

No commentary has been published in English on the Greek text of St John's Gospel since 1928.

The last twenty-five years have, however, witnessed a great deal of research into the critical and historical problems which surround the gospel and what amounts to a rediscovery of its theological significance. The present commentary is both critical and theological. The Introduction includes a full discussion of the sources, structure, and Greek style of the gospel, of its date and place of origin, with a systematic exposition of its theology, and an attempt to place it within the development of early Christian thought.

Royal 8vo *520 pp* *Cloth boards*

S·P·C·K

New and Recent Lutterworth Books

THEOLOGY AND DOCTRINE

Barth-Weber *Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (16/-)
Emil Brunner *Eternal Hope* (18/-)
John C. Bennett *Christian Social Action* (8/6)
Roger Pilkington *Revelation Through Science* (10/6)
J. M. Shaw *Christian Doctrine : A One-Volume Outline* (30/-)
G. W. Bromiley *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (21/-)

CHURCH AND BIBLE

Cosslett Quin *At the Lord's Table* (18/-)
Aage Bentzen *King and Messiah* (Lutterworth Studies) (10/6)
J. F. Mozley *Coverdale and his Bibles* (27/6)
J. B. Phillips *When God Was Man* (3/6)
D. T. Niles *Preaching the Gospel of the Resurrection* (2/-)

HISTORY

J. G. Davies *Social Life of Early Christians* (17/6)
Bengt Sundkler *Church of South India* (25/-)
L. Elliott-Binns *The Early Evangelicals* (Lutterworth Library) (31/6)
Marcus Ward *The Byzantine Church* (C.L.S. Madras Publications) (15/-)
Roland Bainton *The Travail of Religious Liberty* (15/-)
Elspeth Huxley *Kenya Today* (2/6)
C. P. Groves *The Planting of Christianity in Africa*, 3 vols. (Lutterworth Library) (Vol. I, 21/- ; Vol. II, 27/6; Vol. III, 25/-)

BIOGRAPHY

Robert S. Paul *The Lord Protector* (35/-)
Karl Reichelt *The Transformed Abbot* (12/6)
W. J. Kooiman *By Faith Alone, the Life of Martin Luther* (18/-)

ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

Cecil Northcott *Evanston World Assembly* (2/-)

LUTTERWORTH PRESS